

REMARKS

Claims 1-40 were presented for examination and were pending in this application. In a final Office Action dated September 8, 2005, claims 1-40 were rejected. Applicants noted a number of deficiencies in this final Office Action, and discussed same with Examiner via teleconferences on October 3, 2005, December 2, 2005 and December 15, 2005. Applicants forwarded memoranda of these teleconferences via fax, and also forwarded a memorandum of the December 15, 2005 teleconference to Examiner via email. Examiner asserted that he would send a corrected final Office Action with a revised date. Examiner forwarded a revised final Office Action dated December 28, 2006, wherein claims 1-40 were again rejected. Applicants thank Examiner for revising and resending the final Office Action, and for examination of the claims pending in this application. Applicants address Examiner's comments below.

Applicants note that although some corrections were made in the final Office Action mailed December 28, 2005, many if not most of the deficiencies present in the September 8, 2005 version were not corrected. Thus, it appears that Examiner has not fully considered Applicants' claim amendments and other efforts to advance this case. The uncorrected deficiencies include, *inter alia*, incorrect recitation of pending claims as discussed below. By way of example, in the final Office Action dated December 28, 2005, it is apparent that Examiner has considered only a subset of claims 1-4, 9 and 19 as per Applicants' Amendment B and Response dated June 16, 2005. Applicants respectfully note that as presently presented, the claimed invention is patentably distinct because, *inter alia*, the elements not considered by Examiner are not in the cited references, as further discussed herein. Thus, Applicants make no claim amendments herein.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a) in View of Toga and Baker

In paragraph 1 of the revised final Office Action (Page 2), Examiner rejects claims 1-40 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,987,504 to Toga ("Toga") and U.S. Patent No. 6,546,417 to Baker ("Baker"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Representative claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, reformatting messages for multiple display environments, including:

determining a visual presentation of a user interface including a message display area having a first visual format that includes a first display parameter;

receiving a message for display within the message display area, the message having a second visual format that differs from the first visual format such that displaying the message unmodified would generate a misalignment according to the first display parameter;

automatically reformatting the message to generate a reformatted message that conforms with the first visual format; and

displaying the reformatted message within the message display area, wherein the displayed reformatted message conforms to the first display parameter. (emphasis added)

Applicants note that support for the claims can be found in the specification, for example, at paragraphs 0010-0013, 0024, 0026 and 0028. Further Applicants respectfully note that Examiner has failed to identify any references that recite Applicants' claimed features.

The claimed invention determines a visual presentation of a user interface that includes a message display area. The message display area has a first visual format that includes a first display parameter. The claimed invention establishes a format for displaying information to a user according to a display parameter, for example, a line length. The claimed invention receives a message for display within the user interface. The received message has a different visual format, for example, a different line length. The different format would generate a misalignment according to the first display parameter, e.g., a misalignment of the displayed information. This could take the form of a truncated line, i.e., a line that is unnecessarily short and wastes display area. Alternately, this could take the form of words splitting across lines. The claimed invention automatically (e.g., without requiring user involvement) generates and displays a reformatted message that conforms with the first visual format according to the first display parameter. For example, the unnecessary line break could be deleted in the reformatted displayed message, according to the line length display parameter. Thus, the claimed invention provides, *inter alia*, a method of reformatting a message for optimized visual presentation on a user interface, according to a visual format defined by a display parameter.

The claimed invention is not disclosed by the cited references. Toga discloses facilitating information flow through a network. A client creates a request message designating a desired data file and a storage address. The request message is sent to a server according to a first protocol at a first time. The client is connected to a storage device that includes storage locations. The storage device receives the data file and stores the file at a storage location identified by the storage address. The server is connected to the client and sends the data file to the storage device according to a second and different protocol at a

second time. (Toga, column 1 line 65 to column 2 line 9). For example, a request message is sent by a client to a server according to HTTP, identifying a data file and a storage location, such as an E-mail address. In response, the server forwards the requested data file to the E-mail address according to SMTP. (Toga, Abstract).

Toga fails to disclose determining a visual presentation of a user interface including a message display area having a first visual format that includes a first display parameter. Although Toga discloses receiving a message, it fails to disclose receiving a message for display within a message display area, the message having a second visual format that differs from the first visual format. Such a message displayed by the system disclosed in Toga would generate a misalignment according to the first display parameter. Further, Toga fails to disclose automatically reformatting the message to generate a reformatted message that conforms with the first visual format to display the reformatted message within the message display area in a manner that conforms to the first display parameter. Thus, Toga does not disclose any of the elements of amended claim 1 of the claimed invention. Similar arguments apply to amended independent claims 10, 19 and 28.

The emphasized portions of the statements above are just some of the features Examiner has failed to consider in the course of examination. As Applicants point out, these features are lacking in the cited references. Thus, for at least this reason, the claimed invention is distinguishable over the cited references.

Likewise, the cited reference Baker fails to correct the deficiencies of Toga. Baker discloses an E-mail client software having a mailbox displayer which provides a list of E-mail messages with an icon for each message, where the icons are associated with the Multipurpose Internet Mail Extensions (MIME) type. Mail which contains a file attachment

is listed in the inbox with an icon indicative of the type of file attached to the email. The mailbox displayer interprets the MIME type and selects the appropriate icon. (Baker, Abstract).

Baker fails to disclose determining a visual presentation of a user interface including a message display area having a first visual format that includes a first display parameter. As discussed above, the most closely-related disclosure in Baker regards display of E-mail lists that include titles and icons, rather than the content of the E-mail (or other) messages. Since Baker does not disclose displaying the content of the electronic messages, it does not disclose a message display area for presenting message content to a user.

Baker also fails to disclose receiving a message for display within the user interface, the message having a second visual format that differs from the first visual format such that displaying the message unmodified would generate a misalignment according to the first display parameter. As discussed, Baker does not disclose displaying the content of messages within the user interface, but merely discloses displaying message lists.

Likewise, Baker does not disclose automatically reformatting the message to generate a reformatted message that conforms with the first visual format. This is because, as stated, Baker does not present message content, but rather mere message lists. The claimed invention automatically reformats a message according to a user interface's display parameter (e.g., a line length or a maximum number of display lines). For example, the message may be automatically reformatted to correspond with the user interface's format such that introduction of the message into the user interface would not result in individual words splitting across different lines or longer lines displaying as an erratic series of full and truncated lines. In contrast, Baker merely discloses various ways to form an icon associated

with an electronic message and to display the icon and message description in the electronic mail client. Such icon formation and display do not disclose the claimed invention because the content of the electronic message in Baker is never automatically reformatted. Baker thus does not provide the benefit of the claimed invention because Baker does not allow a user to introduce a received message into an interface or database without substantially editing the received message to make it compatible with the interface's format.

Finally, Baker fails to disclose displaying the reformatted message within the user interface, wherein the displayed reformatted message conforms to the first display parameter. As stated, Baker merely discloses presentation of message titles or descriptions, not presentation of the messages themselves. Thus, Baker does not disclose any of the elements of amended claim 1 of the claimed invention. Similar arguments apply to amended independent claims 10, 19 and 28 of the claimed invention.

Nor does Baker address the deficiencies of Toga. To establish a prima facie case for obviousness rejection under 35 USC §103(a), the cited reference or references must collectively disclose or suggest every element of the rejected claim. As discussed above, the cited references do not disclose or suggest any elements of independent claims 1, 10, 19 and 28. Based on the above Amendment and Remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that for at least these reasons claims 1, 10, 19 and 28 are patentably distinguishable over the cited references, both alone and in combination. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner reconsider the rejection, and withdraw it.

Dependent claims 2-9, 11-18, 20-27 and 29-40 variously depend from independent claims 1, 10, 19 and 28 and derive their patentability from the independent claims from which they depend, in addition to reciting additional patentable features. For example, claims 2 and 3 recite that the first visual format further includes a second display parameter; that the displayed reformatted message conforms to the first display parameter and the second display parameter; that the first display parameter is a line length and the second display parameter is a maximum number of display lines. Claims 4-8 recite aspects of the method of automatically reformatting a message. Claim 9 recites an application comprising a network based customer service system which saves the reformatted message in a database. Dependent claims 11-18, 20-27 and 29-40 similarly derive their patentability.

Conclusion

For the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner reconsider and remove the basis for the rejection of the pending claims.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 through 40, as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited references (including references cited, but not applied). Therefore, Applicants also request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to these claims and request allowance of them.

Applicants respectfully invite Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,
Christopher Johns and Peter Kolbus

Date: FEBRUARY 23, 2006 By: 

David Varn, Agent of Record
Registration No. 53,718
FENWICK & WEST LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650) 335-7183
Fax: (650) 938-5200
E-Mail: dvarn@fenwick.com